REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-20 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 14, and 16 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added in this response.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' representative and the Examiner on October 29, 2007. During the telephonic interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed Applicants' proposed amendments that distinctly claim the use of a single transmitter to concurrently communicate over an infrastructure network and an adhoc network. The Examiner agreed that such amendments would read over the art of record because the art of record uses two separate transmitters, one of which to communicate over an adhoc network and another of which to communicate over an infrastructure network. Such amendments are included in this response.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of Applicants' formal drawings filed concurrently with the application.

Claim Rejections – Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,146,133, hereinafter "Bahl") in view of Grobler et al. (U.S. Patent App. No. 2005/0048997, hereinafter "Grobler"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to distinctly claim the use of a single transmitter to concurrently communicate over an infrastructure network and an adhoc network. Support for such amendments may be found in Applicants' specification on page 16, lines 18-28 and, therefore, no new matter is added with such

amendment. As amended, claim 1 is directed towards a method with limitations comprising:

- retrieving an infrastructure configuration profile;
- retrieving an adhoc configuration profile;
- establishing an infrastructure network connection corresponding to the infrastructure configuration profile using a first transmitter included in a wireless device; and
- maintaining the infrastructure network connection while using the first transmitter to concurrently communicate over an adhoc network corresponding to the adhoc configuration profile.

As discussed with the Examiner, Bahl uses two transmitters to communicate over an adhoc network and an infrastructure network, whereas Applicants' invention uses a single transmitter to communicate over an adhoc network and an infrastructure network, thus saving mobile device system cost. Bahl states:

> "The present invention comprises, in part, a method for managing wireless transmission conflicts on a computing device that supports **at least two wireless transmitters** … More particularly, the method comprises a step of identifying a potential signal conflict arising from simultaneous transmissions by **a first wireless transmitter** and **a second wireless transmitter** currently installed on the computing device." (col. 3, lines 61 – col. 4, line 2, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above excerpt, Bahl teaches the use of a first transmitter to communicate over an adhoc network, and the use of a second transmitter to communicate over an infrastructure network. Therefore, Bahl does not teach or suggest "*establishing an infrastructure network connection corresponding to the infrastructure configuration profile* **using a first transmitter** *included in a wireless device; and* **maintaining the infrastructure network connection while using the first transmitter to concurrently communicate over an adhoc network** *corresponding to the adhoc configuration profile*" as claimed by Applicants. The Office Action does not suggest that Grobler teaches such limitations and, indeed, Grobler does not teach or suggest such limitations. Therefore, since neither Bahl nor Grobler teach or suggest, either in part or in combination with each other, all the limitations included in Applicants'

claim 1 as amended, amended claim 1 is allowable over Bahl in view of Grobler. Claim 8 is an information handling system claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claim 14 is a computer program product claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Notwithstanding the fact that claim 3 is dependent upon claim 1 and, therefore, allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable as discussed above, claim 3 adds limitations to claim 1 of:

- using an infrastructure device driver and the first transmitter to maintain the infrastructure network connection while in infrastructure mode;
- using an adhoc device driver and the first transmitter to communicate over the adhoc network while in adhoc mode;
- using a code shim as an infrastructure virtual device driver while the first transmitter is used during adhoc mode; and
- using the code shim as an adhoc virtual device driver while the first transmitter is used during infrastructure mode.

Applicants use a code shim as a virtual device during a particular communication mode (infrastructure or adhoc) when the first transmitter is used during a different communication mode (adhoc or infrastructure). In contrast, Bahr never teaches such limitations because, as discussed above, Bahr uses separate transmitters for communicating in adhoc mode and infrastructure mode. Therefore, Bahr never teaches or suggests both limitations of "*using … the first transmitter to maintain the infrastructure network connection*" and "*using … the first transmitter to communicate over the adhoc network*" as claimed by Applicants. The Office Action does not suggest that Grobler teaches the limitations included in Applicants' claim 3 and, indeed, Grobler does not teach such limitations.

Therefore, since neither Bahl nor Grobler teach or suggest all the limitations included in Applicants' claim 3 as amended, amended claim 3 is allowable over Bahl in view of Grobler. Claim 10 is an information handling system claim including similar limitations as claim 3 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons that

claim 3 is allowable. Claim 16 is a computer program product claim including similar limitations as claim 3 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 3 is allowable.

Each of claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-13, 15, and 17-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 8, or 14. Therefore, each of claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-13, 15, and 17-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable as discussed above.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742